INFORMAL REMARKS

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the claims have been rejected as being anticipated by Amado. It is suggested the Amado reference discloses Applicant's invention. Applicant proposes new claims 1 and 2.

Amado teaches an executive information system for analyzing data to assist an executive with the management of business such as a fast-food branch, gas station, smaller rural institution, etc. (Col. 21, ll. 1-23). The Amado invention is designed to interpret large volumes of data (Col. 24, ll. 10-13) and more importantly, to learn based on a user's input and interaction with the system and apparent priorities (Col. 21, ll.50-55). It uses business data such as sales data, profit data, etc. from many different sources to generate a diagnostics database. Various formulas are applied to the business data to generate the diagnostics which are tied to the original business data. The diagnostics relate directly to the data analysis performed by the system and include such statements as "the companies debt is too large" (Col. 32, ll. 22-26), "the customer service department is falling behind" (Col. 33, ll. 22-25), and "there is a simultaneous downturn in sales and profits for five products" (Col. 43, ll. 40-45).

Applicant proposes new claims 1 and 2 to indicate clearly that the present invention is directed to exploration of a discrete set of decision candidates where each candidate represents an alternative design, a financial investment option, a hypothesis to interpret an experiment, etc. and that the decisions candidates are filtered to produce a set of decision candidates that represent only tradeoffs (i.e., no alternative is better

than another alternative with respect to specified criteria). The tradeoffs are then presented in a viewer so that a user can examine them. It is respectfully submitted that the proposed claims patentably define the invention.

In the office action, the business data has been equated with Applicant's decision candidates and the diagnostics have been equated with filtered decision candidates. Applicant respectfully submits however, that the business data in Amado does not relate in any way to a decision space that comprises alternatives from which a person may choose. The business data is nothing more than factual data that is recorded (e.g., sales) or that is determined based on factual data (e.g., profits). The business data is not represented as alternatives of any type and a user is not expected to "choose" between any elements of the business data. Therefore, the business data does not comprise a decision space. The diagnostics that are produced simply summarize the results of the complex data analysis that Amado performs on the business data and are nothing more than direct statements about the status of a company's operations. The diagnostics, like the business data, do not relate in any way to a decision space and do not represent alternatives from which a person may choose. Furthermore, there is no way to compare diagnostics to determine which might be better according to specified criteria nor does it make sense to compare the diagnostics because they are only textual statements. Therefore, Amado does not teach a discrete set of decision alternatives that is evaluated to produce a set of evaluated candidates and evaluated candidates that are filtered to identify tradeoffs among the evaluated candidates. (In other words, no one candidate is superior to another candidate in all respects.) Amado

also does not teach exploration of the tradeoffs using a viewer. Therefore, the Amado reference cannot support rejection of the claims.

Proposed claim 1 has an additional limitation not present in claim 2. Proposed claim 1 further indicates that a compositional modeling language and corresponding simulator is used to generate the decision alternatives. Applicant respectfully submits that Amado does not teach or even suggest using a compositional modeling language and corresponding simulator to represent and evaluate decision alternatives.